

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
9 Plaintiff,) Case No. 2:14-cr-00194-APG-NJK
10 vs.) ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
11 GLEN COBB, et al.,) IMMEDIATE PRODUCTION OF
12 Defendants.) GRAND JURY MINUTES
) (Docket No. 123)

Pending before the Court is the motion for immediate production of grand jury minutes filed by Defendants Glen Cobb, Charles Cobb, Anna Cobb and Monica Namnard. Docket No. 123. The Court has considered Defendants' motion, the United States' response and Defendants' reply. Docket Nos. 123, 127, 129. For the reasons discussed below, the Court hereby **DENIES** Defendants' motion.

19 On October 2, 2014, Defendants filed their motion for immediate production of grand jury
20 minutes. Docket No. 123. Defendants ask the Court to order the United States to immediately
21 produce transcripts of all grand jury minutes “to determine whether the Government engaged in
22 conduct warranting dismissal of the Indictment.” *Id.*, at 2.¹ In support of their request, Defendants
23 discuss an eavesdropping warrant that was issued in New York for the telephone number of a person
24 named Brandt England. *Id.* According to Defendants, law enforcement in New York used this
25 warrant to intercept Mr. England’s communications from January 16, 2012 until October 2012. *Id.*
26 Defendants further state that, in June 2014, they were indicted in the District of Nevada for certain

¹A federal grand jury sitting in Las Vegas, Nevada issued an indictment against Defendants on June 3, 2014. Docket No. 1.

1 federal offenses and that, prior to presenting its case to the Grand Jury, the United States did not
 2 obtain authorization from a judge to use the intercepted communications from New York. *Id.*, at 3.
 3 Defendants state, without elaboration, that, “[g]iven the Government’s production of evidence thus
 4 far in the [instant] case, it appears that the Government used the Intercepted Communications in
 5 presenting evidence to the Grand Jury [for] both Counts One and Two of the Indictment.” *Id.*
 6 Defendants further state that “[i]f that is indeed the case, dismissal of those counts are [sic] are
 7 warranted.” *Id.*

8 In response, the United States incorporates its response to Defendants’ prior motion for
 9 transcription of grand jury minutes. Docket No. 127, at 1.² *See* Docket No. 109 (United States’
 10 response to Defendant’s motion for transcription of grand jury minutes). The United States submits
 11 that Defendants have failed to demonstrate a particularized need for the grand jury transcripts, as no
 12 evidence of misconduct exists. Docket No. 127, at 2-3. The United States contends that it is entitled
 13 to use the telephonic communications in the instant case with no further authorization. *Id.*, at 3.
 14 Finally, the United States submits that Defendants have failed to proved factual support for their
 15 assertion of misconduct before the grand jury and have, instead, set forth “at best, no more than mere
 16 unsubstantiated, speculative assertions of improprieties in the proceedings.” *Id.*

17 In reply, Defendants submit that the caselaw cited by the United States in its response
 18 supports their position, as their reason for requesting grand jury transcripts is to “confirm an
 19 impropriety that would compel dismissal of the indictment...” Docket No. 129, at 2 (emphasis
 20 removed). Defendants also contend that the United States’ argument is circular, in that the United
 21 States claims that Defendants speculate about the content of the grand jury transcripts and fail to
 22 present factual support for their allegation that the transcripts include the use of the New York
 23 interceptions; however, Defendant cannot know for certain what was used during the grand jury
 24 proceedings without seeing the transcripts. *Id.*, at 3. Finally, Defendants assert, for the first time
 25

26 ²In that motion, Defendants requested, for a different reason than the one set forth in their
 27 instant motion, immediate transcription and production of all grand jury proceedings in the instant
 28 case. Docket No. 101. The Court denied Defendants’ motion on September 9, 2014, finding that
 Defendants had not shown a particularized and compelling need for disclosure that would outweigh
 the general policy of grand jury secrecy. Docket No. 116.

1 in reply, that [a]t a minimum, the Court should conduct an *in camera* review of the transcripts to
 2 confirm that the Government used the intercepted communications before the grand jury.” *Id.*, at
 3 4.

4 **DISCUSSION**

5 The general rule of secrecy of grand jury proceedings is essential to the purpose of the grand
 6 jury process. *United States v. Proctor and Gamble Co.*, 356 U.S. 677, 681 (1958). The exceptions
 7 to the general rule are few, as evidenced by Fed.R.Crim.P 6(e)(3). Under Rule 6(e)(3)(E), “[t]he
 8 court may authorize disclosure ... of a grand jury matter ... at the request of a defendant who shows
 9 that a ground may exist to dismiss the indictment because of a matter that occurred before the grand
 10 jury.” Fed.R.Crim.P. 6(e)(3)(E)(ii). The party seeking the disclosure must show a particularized and
 11 compelling need for the disclosure that outweighs the policy of grand jury secrecy. *In re Grand Jury*
 12 *Investigation*, 642 F.2d 1184, 1191 (9th Cir. 1981); *see also Dennis v. United States*, 384 U.S. 855,
 13 870 (1996). Unsubstantiated speculative assertions of improprieties do not supply the particular
 14 need required to outweigh the policy of grand jury secrecy. *See, e.g., United States v. Ferreboeuf*,
 15 632 F.2d 832, 835 (9th Cir. 1980) (citations omitted).

16 Defendants have not shown a particularized and compelling need for disclosure that would
 17 outweigh the general policy of grand jury secrecy. Defendants’ motion is based on their assertion
 18 that the United States improperly used the New York interceptions without authorization during the
 19 grand jury proceedings. *See Docket No. 123*. The parties have previously fully briefed the issue of
 20 whether the United States was required to obtain additional authorization in order to use the New
 21 York interceptions in the instant case. Docket Nos. 47, 75, 80. The Court held an evidentiary
 22 hearing on a portion of that motion, and entertained oral argument from all parties on the entire
 23 motion. Docket No. 120. After fully considering the briefing, the evidentiary hearing, and oral
 24 argument, the undersigned magistrate judge determined that the United States was not required to
 25 obtain additional authorization to use the New York interceptions and recommended denial of
 26 Defendants’ motion to suppress those communications. Docket No. 128.

27 Defendants’ motion for grand jury transcripts is based solely on their contention that the
 28 United States’ use of the New York interceptions during the grand jury proceedings without prior

1 authorization was inappropriate. As the Court has already found that the United States was not
2 required to obtain additional authorization to use the interceptions, however, Defendants have failed
3 to show "that a ground may exist to dismiss the indictment because of a matter that occurred before
4 the grand jury." Fed.R.Crim.P. 6(e)(3)(E)(ii).

5 Accordingly, based on the foregoing and good cause appearing therefore,

6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' motion for immediate production of grand jury
7 minutes, Docket No. 123, is **DENIED**.

8 DATED this 29th day of October, 2014.

9
10 
11 NANCY J. KOPPE
12 United States Magistrate Judge

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28